



EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

THE DIRECTOR

December 12, 2001

The Honorable Richard B. Cheney  
President of the Senate  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. President:

Enclosed are appropriations reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (section 251(a)(7)), as amended, for P.L. 107-63, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002; P.L. 107-64, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002; P.L. 107-66, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002; P.L. 107-67, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002; and P.L. 107-68, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "ME Daniels Jr", written in a cursive style.

Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.  
Director

Enclosure

Identical Letter Sent to The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert



THE DIRECTOR

EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT  
OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20503

December 12, 2001

The Honorable J. Dennis Hastert  
Speaker of the House of  
Representatives  
Washington, D.C. 20515

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Enclosed are appropriations reports, as required by the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (section 251(a)(7)), as amended, for P.L. 107-63, the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002; P.L. 107-64, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002; P.L. 107-66, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002; P.L. 107-67, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002; and P.L. 107-68, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "M E Daniels Jr".

Mitchell E. Daniels, Jr.  
Director

Enclosure

Identical Letter Sent to The Honorable Richard B. Cheney

**Table 1.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-63**  
**Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
<b><u>EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, EMERGENCY SPENDING .....</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>289</b>
<b><u>Scorekeeping Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of Agriculture:</b>		
Forest Service:		
Wildland fire management .....	-1	60
Budget authority difference is due to rounding. OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority than CBO.		
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
Bureau of Land Management:		
CBO rounding adjustment.....	1	---
CBO uses this account to bring account level detail (tracked in thousands) in line with the bill total (tracked in millions).		
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
Bureau of Land Management:		
Wildland fire management.....	---	148
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$2 million) and higher estimates of prior-year authority (\$150 million) than CBO.		
<b>TOTAL DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>208</b>
<b>OMB ESTIMATE, EMERGENCY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>400</b>	<b>497</b>
<b><u>NON-EMERGENCY CONSERVATION APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, NON-EMERGENCY CONSERVATION APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>1,320</b>	<b>1,029</b>
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of Agriculture:</b>		
Forest Service:		
Capital improvement and maintenance.....	---	11
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$15 million) and lower estimates from prior-year authority (-\$4 million) than CBO.		
Land acquisition accounts.....	---	61
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$46 million) and prior-year authority (\$15 million) than CBO.		

**Table 1.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-63**  
**Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
Bureau of Land Management:		
Management of lands and resources.....	---	7
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$15 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$8 million) than CBO.		
National Park Service:		
Land acquisition and State assistance .....	---	-49
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$30 million) and prior-year authority (-\$19 million) than CBO.		
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:		
Landowner incentive program.....	---	22
OMB has higher estimates of outlays (\$22 million) from new authority than CBO.		
Other technical outlay estimating differences.....	---	23
<b>TOTAL DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>75</b>
<b>OMB ESTIMATE, NON-EMERGENCY CONSERVATION APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>1,320</b>	<b>1,104</b>
<b><u>NON-EMERGENCY OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, NON-EMERGENCY OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>17,400</b>	<b>16,699</b>
<b><u>Scorekeeping Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
Minerals Management Service:		
Royalty and offshore minerals management.....	1	-2
The budget authority difference is due to rounding. OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$4 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$6 million) than CBO.		
National Park Service:		
Historic preservation fund.....	-1	4
The budget authority difference is due to rounding. OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$2 million) and prior-year authority (\$2 million).		
Bureau of Indian Affairs:		
Operation of Indian programs.....	1	-48
The budget authority difference is due to rounding. OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$19 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$67 million).		
CBO FY 2001 Supplemental adjustment.....	---	-41
CBO includes FY 2002 effects of P.L. 107-29, the FY 2001 Supplemental Appropriations Act, in this bill; OMB reported the FY 2002 effects of the Supplemental Act in the 7-day-after report for P.L. 107-20, issued on August 13, 2001.		

**Table 1.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-63**  
**Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	FY 2002	
	<u>BA</u>	<u>OL</u>
CBO rounding adjustment.....	-7	---
CBO uses this account to bring account level detail (tracked in thousands) in line with the bill total (tracked in millions).		
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of Agriculture:</b>		
Forest Service:		
Capital improvement and maintenance.....	---	126
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$120 million) and prior-year authority (\$6 million) than CBO.		
Forest and rangeland research.....	---	15
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$12 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$27 million) than CBO.		
Wildland fire management .....	---	222
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$428 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$206 million) than CBO.		
<b>Department of Energy:</b>		
Energy conservation.....	---	56
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$46 million) and prior-year authority (\$10 million) than CBO.		
Fossil energy research and development.....	---	70
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$52 million) and prior-year authority (\$18 million) than CBO.		
<b>Department of Health and Human Services:</b>		
Indian Health Services.....	---	53
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$53 million) than CBO.		
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
Bureau of Land Management:		
Management of lands and resources.....	---	15
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$23 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$8 million) than CBO.		
Wildland fire management.....	---	98
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$58 million) and from prior-year authority (\$40 million) than CBO.		
Office of Surface Mining:		
Abandoned mine reclamation fund.....	---	-54
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$1 million) and prior-year authority (-\$53 million) than CBO.		

**Table 1.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-63**  
**Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2002</u>	
	<u>BA</u>	<u>OL</u>
U.S. Geological Survey:		
Surveys, investigations, and research.....	---	71
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$28 million) and prior-year authority (\$43 million) than CBO.		
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:		
Resource management.....	---	142
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$25 million) and prior-year authority (\$117 million) than CBO.		
National Park Service:		
Operation of the national park system.....	---	18
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$84 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$102 million) than CBO.		
Construction.....	---	32
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$7 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$39 million) than CBO.		
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians:		
Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians.....	---	11
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$11 million) than CBO.		
<b>Smithsonian Institution:</b>		
Construction.....	---	25
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$3 million) and prior-year authority (\$22 million) than CBO.		
Construction, JFK Center for the Performing Arts.....	---	12
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$6 million) and prior-year authority (\$6 million) than CBO.		
<b>Presidio Trust:</b>	---	-25
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$69 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$44 million) than CBO.		
<b>Institute of Museum and Library Services :</b>		
Office of Museum Services: Grants and administration.....	---	10
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$12 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$2 million) than CBO.		
Other technical outlay estimating differences.....	---	3
<b>TOTAL DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>-6</b>	<b>813</b>
<b>OMB ESTIMATE, NON-EMERGENCY OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>17,394</b>	<b>17,512</b>

**Table 2.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-64**  
**Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
<b><u>OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>10,500</b>	<b>9,190</b>
<b><u>Scorekeeping Differences:</u></b>		
<p>Note: Section 132 of P.L. 107-64 includes an across-the-board rescission to all accounts in the Act except for the Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) Account and the NATO Security and Investment Program Account. CBO scores the impact of section 132 as a general reduction to the bill. OMB scores the reduction by account.</p>		
<b>Department of Defense:</b>		
Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC).....	1	-277
<p>The BA difference is due to rounding. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$7 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$270 million).</p>		
Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account.....	60	---
<p>Section 130 of the Act rescinds \$60 million from the Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account, Construction. CBO scored the impact of section 130 into this account in the Operation and Maintenance bureau.</p>		
Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account, Construction.....	-60	---
<p>Section 130 of the Act rescinds \$60 million from the Foreign Currency Fluctuation Account, Construction. CBO scored the impact of section 130 into the Foreign Currency Fluctuation account in the Operation and Maintenance bureau.</p>		
Military Construction, Army.....	-20	-78
<p>The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$1 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$77 million).</p>		
Military Construction, Navy.....	-13	-155
<p>The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$34 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$121 million).</p>		
Military Construction, Air Force.....	-13	-16
<p>The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$2 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$14 million).</p>		
Military Construction, Defense-wide.....	-9	-54
<p>The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$19 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$73 million).</p>		

**Table 2.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-64**  
**Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2002</u>	
	<u>BA</u>	<u>OL</u>
Military Construction, Army Reserve..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$3 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$6 million).	-2	-3
Military Construction, Naval Reserve..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$1 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$7 million).	-1	-6
Military Construction, Air Force Reserve..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$1 million).	-1	-1
Military Construction, Army National Guard..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$8 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$14 million).	-5	-6
Military Construction, Air National Guard..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$1 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$11 million).	-3	10
Family Housing, Army..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$6 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$23 million).	-16	-17
Family Housing, Navy and Marine Corps..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$7 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$13 million).	-14	6
Family Housing, Air Force..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$37 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$37 million).	-16	-74
CBO rounding adjustment section 132..... The BA difference is due to differing treatment of section 132, as explained above. In addition, OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$28 million) than CBO.	113	28
CBO FY 2001 Supplemental Adjustment..... CBO includes FY 2002 effects of P.L. 107-20, the FY 2001 Supplemental Appropriations Act, in this bill; OMB reported the FY 2002 effects of the Supplemental Act in the 7-day-after report for P.L. 107-20, issued on August 13, 2001.	---	-43

**Table 2.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-64**  
**Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
CBO rounding adjustment.....	1	---
CBO uses this account to bring account level detail (tracked in thousands) in line with the bill total (tracked in millions).		
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of Defense:</b>		
NATO Security Investment Program.....	---	-97
OMB has higher estimates of outlays from new authority (\$12 million) and lower estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (-\$109 million).		
Family Housing Improvement Fund.....	---	32
OMB has lower estimates of outlays from new authority (-\$1 million) and higher estimates of outlays from prior-year authority (\$33 million).		
Other Technical Outlay Estimating Differences.....	---	-9
<b>TOTAL DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>-760</b>
<b>OMB ESTIMATE, OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>10,502</b>	<b>8,430</b>

**Table 3.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-66**  
**Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
<b><u>OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>24,596</b>	<b>24,770</b>
<b><u>Scorekeeping Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of Energy:</b>		
Energy Programs:		
Federal energy regulatory commission fees and recoveries.....	-26	-26
CBO estimates offsetting collections equal to spending. OMB estimates offsetting collections in excess of the appropriation to the account.		
<b>Corps of Engineers:</b>		
San Gabriel basin restoration fund.....	-3	18
CBO assumes \$12 million of funding for the San Gabriel Basin restoration fund in the Corps of Engineers; OMB assumes \$12 million of funding for this account in the Department of the Interior. CBO shows receipts and expenditures in the same account; OMB tracks the expenditure account, two receipt accounts (for Federal and non-Federal contributions) and the interest account separately. CBO assumes no non-Federal contribution; OMB assumes a non-Federal contribution of \$9 million. CBO assumes a spendout rate of 60 percent; OMB assumes a rate of 100 percent. CBO assumes no outlays from prior-year balances; OMB shows outlays from prior-year authority totaling \$16 million.		
Non-federal contributions, San Gabriel basin restoration fund.....	-9	-9
OMB assumes \$9 million in non-Federal contributions and shows these receipts in a separate account. CBO does not have a similar account.		
Inland waterways trust fund.....	18	22
CBO assumes \$61 million for the inland waterway trust fund contribution based on the FY 2002 Budget. OMB uses an updated estimate of \$79 million to reflect conference bill project differences from the Budget. CBO assumes no outlays from prior-year balances. OMB shows outlays from prior-year balances totaling \$16 million.		
Harbor Maintenance.....	44	44
CBO assumes a harbor maintenance trust fund contribution of \$675 million based on the FY 2002 Budget. OMB uses an updated estimate of \$719 million to reflect conference bill project differences from the Budget. CBO uses a dredged material disposal rate of \$9 million. OMB uses the dredged material disposal figure cited in the conference report of \$5 million.		
Construction, general.....	-14	258
CBO assumes a rate for the inland waterway trust fund contribution based on the FY 2002 Budget. OMB uses an updated estimate to reflect conference bill project differences from the Budget. CBO assumes a higher outlay rate for dredge disposal. CBO assumes lower outlays from prior-year authority than does OMB.		

**Table 3.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-66**  
**Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<u>BA</u>	<u>OL</u>
Operation and Maintenance, general..... CBO assumes a rate for the harbor maintenance contribution based on the FY 2002 Budget. OMB uses an updated estimate to reflect conference bill project differences from the Budget. CBO assumes a spendout rate of 80 percent and OMB assumes a spendout rate of 75 percent.	-48	-51
<b>Denali Commission:</b>		
Denali Commission trust fund..... The difference in budget authority and outlays is due to CBO's scoring of the Denali Commission trust fund in the FY 2002 Agriculture and Rural Development Appropriations bill. OMB scores the trust fund appropriation in the Energy and Water Development Appropriations bill.	11	11
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
Water and related resources..... CBO assumes \$12 million of funding for the San Gabriel Basin restoration fund in the Corps of Engineers. OMB assumes \$12 million of funding for this account in the Department of the Interior. CBO assumes lower outlays from prior-year balances than does OMB. CBO assumes an outlay rate of 65 percent. OMB assumes an outlay rate of 60 percent.	12	-4
Contributions from project beneficiaries, Utah mitigation..... OMB shows the receipts for contributions from project beneficiaries in a separate account. CBO does not have a companion account.	-6	-6
CBO FY 2001 Supplemental adjustment..... CBO includes FY 2002 effects of the P.L. 107-20, FY 2001 Supplemental Appropriations Act, in this bill; OMB reported the FY 2002 effects of the Supplemental Act in the 7-day-after report for P.L. 107-20, issued on August 13, 2001.	-1	-290
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of Energy:</b>		
National Nuclear Security Administration:		
Weapons activities..... CBO estimates higher outlays from prior-year balances than OMB.	---	-24
Cerro Grande fire activities..... CBO estimates higher outlays from prior-year balances than OMB.	---	-43
Office of the Administrator..... CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 80 percent, OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 83 percent.	---	58
Environmental and Other Defense Activities:		
Other defense activities..... CBO estimates higher outlays from prior-year balances than OMB. CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 65 percent. OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 75 percent.	---	-20

**Table 3.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-66**  
**Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	FY 2002	
	<u>BA</u>	<u>OL</u>
Defense environmental management privatization.....	---	-72
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 53 percent. OMB assumes first-year outlays of zero.		
<b>Energy Programs:</b>		
Uranium facilities maintenance and remediation.....	---	-28
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 70 percent. OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 62 percent.		
Nuclear waste disposal.....	---	20
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 80 percent. OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 50 percent. CBO estimates lower outlays from prior-year balances than does OMB.		
<b>Power Marketing Administration:</b>		
Construction, rehabilitation, operation and maintenance, WAPA.....	---	-10
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 50 percent. OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 45 percent.		
<b>Appalachian Regional Commission:</b>		
Appalachian Regional Commission.....	---	10
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 10 percent. OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 33 percent.		
<b>Denali Commission:</b>		
Denali Commission.....	---	13
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 55 percent. OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 67 percent.		
<b>Nuclear Regulatory Commission:</b>		
Nuclear Regulatory Commission.....	---	-28
CBO assumes a first-year spendout rate of 70 percent and OMB assumes a first-year spendout rate of 75 percent. CBO estimates higher outlays from prior-year balances than does OMB.		
<b>Department of the Interior:</b>		
<b>Bureau of Reclamation:</b>		
California Bay-Delta restoration fund.....	---	-49
CBO assumes outlays from prior-year balances totaling \$49 million. OMB does not assume any prior-year outlays.		
Other technical outlay estimating differences.....	---	-1
<b>TOTAL OTHER DISCRETIONARY DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>-22</b>	<b>-207</b>
<b>OMB ESTIMATE, OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>24,574</b>	<b>24,563</b>

**Table 4.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-67**  
**Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
<b><u>OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS .....</b>	<b>17,069</b>	<b>16,256</b>
<b><u>Scorekeeping Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of the Treasury:</b>		
Customs Services at Small Airports (offsetting receipts).....	3	3
CBO scores \$3 million in offsetting receipts as discretionary while OMB scores the receipts as mandatory.		
United States Mint, Public Enterprise Fund.....	-4	-11
CBO and OMB have different estimates for the amount of capital stock and it's depreciation.		
<b>General Service Administration:</b>		
Federal Buildings Fund.....	2	37
The budget authority difference is due to rounding that occurs as a result of various sub-account splits. Outlay differences are due to CBO using lower first-year spendout rates and different estimates of prior-year outlays.		
<b>Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation:</b>		
Morris K. Udall Scholarship and Excellence in National Environmental Policy Foundation....	-1	-2
The budget authority difference is the result of rounding.		
CBO rounding adjustment.....	-1	---
CBO uses this account to bring account level detail (tracked in thousands) in line with the bill total (tracked in millions).		
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Department of the Treasury:</b>		
Departmental Offices, Salaries and Expenses.....	---	28
CBO estimates outlays from new authority as \$2 million less than OMB and outlays from prior-year authority as \$26 million less than OMB.		
Treasury Building and Annex Repair and Restoration .....	---	12
CBO assumes a 24 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 72 percent first-year spendout rate.		
Treasury Franchise Fund.....	---	-9
CBO assumes no outlays for this account.		
Acquisitions, Construction, Improvements, and Related Expenses (FLETC) .....	---	9
CBO estimates prior-year outlays as \$9 million lower than OMB.		
Laboratory Facilities and Headquarters (Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco and Firearms).....	---	10
CBO estimates prior-year outlays as \$10 million lower than OMB.		
Bureau of Engraving and Printing Fund.....	---	20
CBO assumes no outlays for this account.		

**Table 4.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-67**  
**Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
Business System Modernization.....	---	146
CBO assumes a 10 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 37 percent first-year spendout rate. OMB also estimates \$40 million more than CBO in prior-year outlays.		
<b>Federal Drug Control Programs:</b>		
High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas Program.....	---	49
CBO assumes a 25 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 32 percent first-year spendout rate. OMB also estimates \$34 million more than CBO in prior-year outlays.		
Special Forfeiture Fund.....	---	59
CBO assumes a 30 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 60 percent first-year spendout rate. OMB also estimates \$13 million more than CBO in prior-year outlays.		
<b>General Service Administration:</b>		
E-government.....	---	4
CBO assumes a 25 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 90 percent first-year spendout rate.		
<b>National Archives and Record Administration:</b>		
National Historic Publications and Records Commission.....	---	3
CBO assumes a 50 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 100 percent first-year spendout rate.		
Repairs and Restoration.....	---	46
CBO assumes a 18 percent first-year spendout rate while OMB assumes a 45 percent first-year spendout rate, and a difference of \$19 million in prior-year outlays.		
Other technical outlay estimating differences.....	---	-117
<b>TOTAL DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>
	<b>-1</b>	<b>287</b>
<b>OMB ESTIMATE, OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>-----</b>	<b>-----</b>
	<b>17,068</b>	<b>16,543</b>

**Table 5.**  
**Estimates Contained in P.L. 107-68**  
**Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<b>FY 2002</b>	
	<b><u>BA</u></b>	<b><u>OL</u></b>
<b><u>OTHER DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS</u></b>		
<b>CBO ESTIMATE, NON-DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</b>	<b>2,974</b>	<b>2,941</b>
<b><u>Scorekeeping Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Legislative Branch:</b>		
Architect of the Capitol -- Capitol buildings, salaries and expenses.....	-1	4
The budget authority difference results from differences in rounding. OMB estimates higher outlays from new authority (\$6 million) and lower outlays from prior-year authority (-\$2 million) than CBO.		
CBO rounding adjustment.....	1	---
CBO scores the bill total in thousands and then rounds the total in millions. This adjustment brings the detail (scored in millions) in line with the total.		
CBO FY 2001 Supplemental adjustment.....	---	-43
CBO includes FY 2002 effects of P.L. 107-20, the FY 2001 Supplemental Appropriations Act, in this bill; OMB reported the FY 2002 effects of the Supplemental Act in the 7-day-after report for P.L. 107-20, issued on August 13, 2001.		
<b><u>Technical Outlay Estimating Differences:</u></b>		
<b>Legislative Branch:</b>		
Senate.....	---	34
OMB estimates higher outlays from new authority (\$79 million) and lower outlays from prior-year authority (-\$45 million) than CBO.		
House of Representatives.....	---	22
OMB estimates higher outlays from new authority (\$43 million) and lower outlays from prior-year authority (-\$21 million) than CBO.		
Joint Items .....	---	-12
OMB estimates higher outlays from new authority (\$8 million) and lower outlays from prior-year authority (-\$20 million) than CBO.		
Architect of the Capitol.....	---	49
OMB estimates higher outlays from new authority (\$11 million) and higher outlays from prior-year authority (\$38 million) than CBO.		
Library of Congress.....	---	-23
OMB estimates higher outlays from new authority (\$6 million) and lower outlays from prior-year authority (-\$29 million) than CBO.		
Other technical outlay estimating differences.....	---	-5
<b>TOTAL DIFFERENCES.....</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>26</b>
<b><u>OMB ESTIMATE, NON-DEFENSE DISCRETIONARY APPROPRIATIONS.....</u></b>	<b><u>2,974</u></b>	<b><u>2,967</u></b>



**Table 6.**  
**ENACTED APPROPRIATIONS AS OF November 23, 2001**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2001</u>		<u>FY 2002</u>	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Other Discretionary Spending</b>				
Other Discretionary Spending Limits <sup>1</sup> .....	640,803	620,392	546,945	537,383
Amount Previously Enacted.....	640,801	620,350	73	1,549
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-63, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	17,794	18,009
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-64, Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	10,502	8,430
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-66, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	24,574	24,563
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-67, Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	17,068	16,543
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-68, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	2,974	2,967
Total Enacted, Other Discretionary Spending.....	640,801	620,350	72,985	72,061
<b>Appropriations over/under (-) spending limits.....</b>				
	-2	-42	-473,960	-465,322
<b>Total Discretionary Spending</b>				
Total Discretionary Spending limits <sup>1</sup> .....	640,803	651,951	548,705	572,379
Amount Previously Enacted.....	640,801	651,886	73	1,549
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-63, Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	19,114	19,113
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-64, Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	10,502	8,430
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-66, Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	24,574	24,563

**Table 6.**  
**ENACTED APPROPRIATIONS AS OF November 23, 2001**  
(in millions of dollars)

	<u>FY 2001</u>		<u>FY 2002</u>	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-67, Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	17,068	16,543
Amount Provided in P.L. 107-68, Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002.....	N/A	N/A	2,974	2,967
Total Enacted, Total Discretionary Spending.....	640,801	651,886	74,305	73,165
<b>Appropriations Over/Under (-) Spending Limits.....</b>	<b>-2</b>	<b>-65</b>	<b>-474,400</b>	<b>-499,214</b>

<sup>1</sup> FY 2001 and FY 2002 limits are the limits included in the August Update Report that was transmitted to the Congress on August 22, 2001. They include: enacted emergency appropriations and released contingent emergency appropriations, as permitted under the Budget Enforcement Act (BEA) of 1997.



CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE  
U.S. CONGRESS  
WASHINGTON, DC 20515

Dan L. Crippen  
Director

November 15, 2001

Honorable Mitchell E. Daniels Jr.  
Director  
Office of Management and Budget  
Washington, DC 20503

Dear Mr. Daniels:

The Congressional Budget Office, after consultation with the Committees on the Budget of the House of Representatives and the Senate, provides the enclosed estimates of budget authority, outlays, and revenues for the following bills:

- P.L. 107-63, the Department of Interior and Related Agencies Appropriation Acts, 2002;
- P.L. 107-64, the Military Construction Appropriations Act, 2002;
- P.L. 107-66, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002;
- P.L. 107-67, the Treasury and General Government Appropriations Act, 2002;
- P.L. 107-68, the Legislative Branch Appropriations Act, 2002; and
- H.R. 2620, the Departments of Veterans' and Housing and Urban Development and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 2002.

These estimates are required by section 251 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

Honorable Mitchell E, Daniels Jr.

Page 2

This information has been provided to OMB staff, and we will be happy to provide additional information if necessary. The CBO staff contacts are Jodi Gapps (for Interior), Bob Sempsey (for Military Construction), Amy Wendholt (for Energy and Water), Catherine Little (for Treasury, and Veterans' and Housing and Urban Development), and Janet Airis (for Legislative Branch), They can be reached at 226-2850.

Sincerely,



*DC*  
Dan L. Crippen  
Director

**Table 1. Estimated Discretionary Budgetary Impact of Fiscal Year 2002 Appropriations Bills as Passed by the Congress, Through November 9, 2001**

	Fiscal Year 2002, in Millions of Dollars					
	Non-Emergencies		Emergencies		Total	
	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays	BA	Outlays
<b>Discretionary Appropriations</b>						
Interior (P.L. 107-63)						
General purpose	17,400	16,699	400	289	17,800	16,988
Conservation	<u>1,320</u>	<u>1,029</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>1,320</u>	<u>1,029</u>
Subtotal	18,720	17,728	400	289	19,120	18,017
Military Construction (P.L. 107-64)	10,500	9,190	0	0	10,500	9,190
Energy and Water (P.L. 107-66)	24,596	24,770	0	0	24,596	24,770
Treasury (P.L. 107-67)	17,069	16,256	0	0	17,069	16,256
Legislative Branch (P.L. 107-68)	2,974	2,941	0	0	2,974	2,941
Veterans' and Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 2620)	<u>83,934</u>	<u>88,463</u>	<u>1,500</u>	<u>0</u>	<u>85,434</u>	<u>88,463</u>
Total	157,793	159,348	1,900	289	159,693	159,637

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office.

NOTES: BA = Budget Authority

P.L. = Public Law

Estimates include outlays resulting from appropriations provided in prior years.

Table 2. Estimated Pay-As-You-Go Budgetary Impact of Fiscal Year 2002 Appropriations Bills as Passed by the Congress, Through November 9,2001

	<b>By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars</b>									
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2010
<b>Pay-As-You-Go Estimate—Changes in Receipts</b>										
Bontanic Garden gifts and donations (Legislative Branch)	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
EPA registration fees	-24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Manufactured housing fees (Veterans' and Housing and Urban Development)	-8	-9	-9	-10	-10	-10	-11	-11	-11	-12
Total Changes	-30	-9	-9	-10	-10	-10	-11	-11	-11	-12

SOURCE: Congressional Budget Office

NOTE: Only amount in the budget year and the subsequent four years are counted for purposes of enforcing pay-as-you-go procedures.